



VU Research Portal

The Problem of Schematism in Kant and its Transformation in South-West Neo-Kantianism

Krijnen, CH

published in

Kant Yearbook
2020

DOI (link to publisher)

[10.1515/kantyb-2020-0004](https://doi.org/10.1515/kantyb-2020-0004)

document version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

document license

Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

Krijnen, CH. (2020). The Problem of Schematism in Kant and its Transformation in South-West Neo-Kantianism. *Kant Yearbook*, 12(1), 81-114. <https://doi.org/10.1515/kantyb-2020-0004>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl

Christian Krijnen

The Problem of Schematism in Kant and its Transformation in Southwest Neo-Kantianism

Abstract: The meaning and validity of Kant's doctrine of schematism remains contested until today. In neo-Kantianism and post-War transcendental philosophy, Kant's schematism of the pure concepts of understanding is transformed drastically. Kant's thesis of heterogeneity is overcome by taking it back into the internal relationships of the structure of cognition. The spontaneity of thought, performing schematizations, is retained, but Kant's project of conceiving of the foundations of knowledge in the fashion of a theory of apperception of the I as well as the externality of the given and the determination of the given that goes along with it is sublated by an objective order of validity-noematic constitution and regulation. Kant's doctrine of schematism, then, shows to be methodology.

Introduction

In two recent dissertations on Kant,¹ a problem that has always occurred in discussions about Kant plays a major role. Heidegger (1951, 1962) even managed to turn the issue into a vital question: the problem of schematism. The broad spectrum of interpretations of Kant's doctrine of schematism is rather surprising taking into account that Kant himself labelled the chapter on schematism as one of the most important parts of the *Critique of Pure Reason*. The interpretations reach from defending that the doctrine of schematism is superfluous because of the transcendental deduction of pure concepts of understanding up to supplying this deduction originally.²

1 See Birrer (2017) and Bunte (2016). Both authors also sketch the state of research (Birrer 2017, ch. 1; Bunte 2016, 51 ff.). For the reception of Kant's doctrine also see: Allison (2004, 202 ff.); Dising (1995); Höffe (2003, 152 ff.).

2 Against this background, see the interpretation of Caimi (2015). For Birrer (2017, 5 ff.), however, Caimi presents a "revisionist reading" that marginalizes the role of sensibility in Kant's framework of the heterogeneous sources sensibility and understanding. In contrast, Birrer holds that the relationship between sensibility and understanding is continuously redetermined in the course of Kant's line of argument while at the same time respecting their independence.

It cannot be overlooked that in the discussion about Kant's schematism the attempts of Southwest Neo-Kantianism and post-war transcendental philosophers influenced by it, like Hans Wagner and Werner Flach, to relativize Kant's heterogeneity of the two sources of knowledge – sensibility and understanding – by means of a foundational unity, are not dealt with as such.³ Let alone that the approach of Hegel to overcoming Kant's dualistic conception with a philosophy of self-mediation of the concept is discussed as a truly intellectual challenge. Yet neither in Kantian transcendental philosophy nor in Hegel's speculative idealism does Kant's schematism play the important role that it should play according to Kant himself. Rather, they aim to solve Kant's problem of schematism – by not letting it arise in the first place.

In what follows I shall show this with regard to Southwest Neo-Kantianism. In the final section of this essay, post-war transcendental philosophy will enter the stage to press forward the continuity of the results of the Neo-Kantian appropriation of Kant. It is my thesis that Kantian transcendental philosophy offers relief from a weak point of Kant's transcendental idealism. Although I shall not go into the issue of whether Kantian transcendental philosophy can cope sufficiently with Hegel's challenge of the concept, it becomes clear that the discussion of Kant's schematism and its relevance for contemporary philosophy requires perspectives that go beyond the usual lines of interpretation.

(Kant's *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* is quoted from the Cambridge Edition *Critique of Pure Reason* (Kant 1998); all other translations of German sources are mine.)

3 Bunte (2017) is an exception. Birrer, like Bunte, not interested in the problem of schematism from a merely historical perspective, does not deal with the mentioned tradition but with an early Neo-Kantian like Riehl and in particular Marburgian Neo-Kantians like Cohen and Cassirer (Birrer 2017, 12ff.). The transcendental philosophy of Wagner and Flach, which is developed in close discussion with Kant, plays no role in his presentation of “contemporary Kant scholarship” (Birrer 2017, 19ff.). For him, the point of the Neo-Kantians is to demonstrate that an “intellectual meaning of conceptual necessity” is already part of “sensible intuitive representations”. In contrast to this view, the present article will, among others, show that for the discussed tradition of transcendental philosophy, the dualism of intuition and concept that Birrer presents has already transcended the original togetherness of these moments in the cognitive relationship. In this respect, Bunte (2016) seems more profound. As a consequence of his approach, Kant's concept of the thing-in-itself turns into a final problem (Bunte 2016, ch. 3.3). After having explained its conceivability (Bunte 2016, ch. 3.3.1), the possibility of its experience turns out to be a “residual problem” (Bunte 2016, 303), or, to be more precise, an “unsolvable” problem (Bunte 2016, 310). This leads to a remarkable tension between the relevance of Kant, asserted continuously by Bunte, and the unsolvable residual problem he diagnosed. Apparently, the presuppositions of Kant's dualism of knowledge sources are in need of a more in-depth (‘critical’) investigation.

1 The Problem for which Kant's Schematism of Pure Concepts is a Solution

There is no disagreement about the fact that Kant's chapter on schematism deals with a problem of mediation that results from his architectonic of theoretical knowledge. The heterogeneity of intuition (*repraesentatio singularis*, *Einzelvorstellung*) and concept (*repraesentatio generalis*, *Allgemeinvorstellung*) needs to be brought into a relationship concerning the concrete determination of objects. Schematism generally concerns the relationship between an undetermined content (*Inhalt*) of cognition and its determining form (hence, not the traditional subsumption of universals and individuals): they have to come together in an adequate way. For this, a schema is needed, be it a schema of pure concepts of sensibility, of empirical concepts, of pure concepts of understanding, or even a schema of the idea.⁴ Schemata function here as rules for the application of rules, or, to be more precise, as conditions of applications of rules. In this respect, for Kant the issue of schematism addresses a necessary principle of mediation regarding form and content. Otherwise, the principle would remain a mere function without being capable of representing an object: There would be no object as a formed content. Without schemata, as Kant says, "the actions of the understanding" as well as the "unity of reason" that results from it, would remain "undetermined" in itself (*CPR* A 664/B 692f.). Although the issue of schematism has a general meaning that goes beyond the specific meaning of the mentioned types of schemata, in view of the transformation in subsequent German idealism, I shall focus on the foundational level of the relationship between intuition and category (pure concept of understanding). This focus also concerns the basic structure of the cognitive relationship as conceived of by Kant – a relationship between intuition and concept, form and content. For Kant too, the transcendental schemata are decisive as the conditions of the possibility of knowledge.

What problem does the schematism of pure concepts of understanding intend to solve? We could say a problem of concretization. The chapter of schematism is not about justifying the legitimate use of categories as principles of the determinacy of objects, as is the case in the chapter on transcendental deduc-

⁴ Although in the chapter on schematism Kant does not mention the schema of the idea, the first three schemata mentioned do not exhaust Kant's doctrine of schematism (pace Bunte (2016, 58 note 219)). It is often not taken into account that Kant also integrates a schema of reason (see e. g. Düsing (1995, 50 ff.) or Höffe (2003, 154 f.)). For its execution, the idea too requires a "schema" (*CPR* B 860). On the relevance of the schema of the idea for the development of a system of philosophy see Krijnen (2008b, ch. 6.1.2).

tion; rather, it has to make plausible how categories can be applied to objects (*CPR* A 138/B 177). The categorical synthesis of understanding does not make an object, but the object is given by sensibility as an object that is in need of determination. The universal form of sensibility is time. Objects appear in time. The category, as Kant holds, is with respect to the object given in time, on which it is applied, totally “heterogenous” (*CPR* A 138/B 177) or “un-homogenous” (*CPR* A 137/B 176). Yet “subsumption” of an object under a concept presupposes homogeneity. How can categories, pure logical, timeless concepts, be applied to objects given in time? This requires a mediating “third” factor, i. e. a specific “representation” that should be pure and both “sensible” and “intellectual” (a priori governed): it should be homogeneous with the category and the appearance (*CPR* A 138/B 177).

In the *background* of the heterogeneity that needs to be overcome by schematism stands the heterogeneity of intuition and concept or sensibility and understanding, continuously emphasized by Kant. As Kant writes in the chapter on schematism, compared to empirical concepts or even sensible intuitions, pure concepts of understanding are “entirely non-homogenous” (*CPR* A 137/B 176). From this, the heterogeneity of category and appearance results; the latter presupposes the former. The “transcendental determination of time” fulfills, according to Kant, the required condition of homogeneity. Like the category it is “general” and based upon a “rule a priori,” and it is also homogenous with the appearance as “time” is contained in every empirical representation of a manifoldness; the transcendental determination of time is for Kant the schema of the category (*CPR* A 138/B 177f.). Herewith concrete knowledge of an object is achieved. Concrete knowledge of an object is both pure synthesis and an immediate relation to an object. Contingency is conceived of as a categorical founded unity, that is to say, concrete determination of an object. In this respect, the application of categories on appearances as objects of cognition is clarified.

Kant’s thesis of a complete heterogeneity of category and appearance, involving the need for a mediating schema with regard to any concrete determination of objects, hence knowledge, is sufficient to notice that in subsequent Kantian transcendental philosophy such a schema is missing, at least as a basic element of the definition of knowledge.⁵ Kant’s problem of schematism concerns here, at the most, a subordinate issue, not a fundamental problem of the theory of knowledge. What are the reasons for this significant transformation?

To begin with an evergreen of Kant scholarship, it cannot concern an irrelevancy in the sense of Kemp Smith (informed by Curtius (1914)). His argument

⁵ The same applies to Hegel’s speculative idealism.

is that intuitions and categories are either not fully heterogenous, otherwise subsumption would be impossible, or the opposite is the case, with the result that schematism is redundant (Kemp Smith 1918, 318). For some interpreters, this criticism is supposed to be not only close to “Neo-Kantian interpretations” but also an expression of an Aristotelian type of ontological hyletic sensualism (Birrer 2017, 2f. with 17). The latter interpretation touches upon two intrinsically related perspectives that are relevant for an assessment of the way the Southwest Neo-Kantians deal with the problem of schematism.

First, for Southwest Neo-Kantians the relationship of form and content qualifies the validity structure of knowledge. In this respect it stands beyond any onticism of a sensible matter that obtains non-sensible forms by thought, resulting in a cosmos, a formed entity. By contrast, the relationship concerns, to speak in Kant's terms, two types of representation: intuition as a representation of an individual and the concept as a representation of a something general. Hence, it concerns a relationship of capacities of reason, modelled in the fashion of a theory of representations, not an ontology of different types of being. For Kant, the “manifoldness of given representations” (intuitions or concepts) is unified in an “apperception” by means of an “action of understanding” that is the “logical function of judgments” (CPR B 143). Therefore, the manifoldness is “determined” with regard to a function of judgment that brings it to “consciousness” (CPR B 143). Moreover, as the categories are nothing but these functions for judging (in their significance for the content and hence for reality), any manifoldness of a given intuition are subject to the categories (CPR B 143). To formulate it with Hegel, being is a determination of thought, or as the Neo-Kantian Rickert puts it, content is itself a form and objects are always objects of knowledge. Thus, the relationship at issue, the problem of mediation, concerns an *intragnoseological* relationship. On top of that, in the first instance, it does not concern the relationship of category and object but of intuition and concept: the object as a constituted entity is always already the result of a categorical synthesis. The issue of schematism concerns the problem of determination of concrete objects or the concrete determinacy of objects (Kant: ‘subsumption of objects under a concept’); categories are attached to concrete objects, and hence pure concepts of understanding applied to sensibility under the conditions of sensibility. In this way it becomes apparent why we are capable of making fundamental statements (synthetical judgements a priori) about nature as an object of knowledge. From the pure concepts of understanding flow synthetic judgments a priori that subsequently function as general principles (*Grundsätze*) for any knowledge of objects. These principles establish constitutively the concrete determination of objects. Categories, therefore, are not merely related to sensibility in general but

related to sensibility in a *concretizing* way; determinacy is singularized.⁶ Categorical determinacy is transformed into a general determinacy that leads to singularized determinacy. This singularization of determinacy is the subject matter of the chapter of schematism. Something heterogeneous – that is to say the intellectuality of the category and the intuitive manifoldness of the (inner) sense, *repraesentatio generalis* and *repraesentatio singularis* – is mediated. The schema is the “third” factor, the a priori-conceptual representation that mediates both. The unity of synthesis, modelled in terms of a theory of apperception, is mediated with a singular intuition. The result is the “unity in the determination of sensibility” (CPR A 140/B 179). This finally leads to Kant’s conception of the empirical world as a world governed by natural laws. The doctrine of schematism develops the laws of the empirical world as laws that are subordinated to the laws of pure understanding. Concrete determination of objects, knowledge of nature, is according to Kant lawful determination.

Second, the Southwest Neo-Kantians do not conceive of the cognitive relationship in the fashion of a theory of representation, as Kant does, but in terms of *structures of validity*: knowledge is addressed regarding the structure of its validity. This structure is a structure not of capacities or powers but of functions of validity. Kant’s idea that knowledge is conducted in judgments and concepts are based upon functions of judging leads in Southwest Neo-Kantianism to a conception that qualifies knowledge as a whole of principles, of functions of objective determinacy in its validity. By contrast, Kant gives this pure determinacy-logical issue of determination of objects, oriented towards judgments, an, as we could say, apperception-theoretical twist: he integrates the competence to determine objects by the ‘I think’ in his conception of the foundations of knowledge.⁷ From a systematic perspective, Kant’s own distinction between a subjective and an objective deduction has led subsequent transcendental philosophy to the ‘primacy’ of determining the foundations of knowledge in a validity-noematic or objective-logical orientation, in an orientation that concerns the *content* (*Gehalt*) of knowledge (Krijnen 2008a; 2014a). Consequently, the issue of a cognizing subject that appropriates the object of cognition is at most a subsequent theme. The function of an ‘I think’ as the highest unity of apperception is rendered explicit in a validity-noematic fashion.⁸

⁶ Flach underlined this in his interpretation of Kant’s schematism (Flach 2001; 2002, 160 ff.).

⁷ Flach, possibly the most consistent proponent of a pure validity-functional conception of the foundations of knowledge (see Flach 1994), stresses this in his interpretation of Kant (Flach 2002, 112 ff.).

⁸ For Hegel, the science of logic is a doctrine of the idea in the abstract element of thought. Constellations of reality, more specifically a knowing subject, also do not play a role here; the func-

2 On the Southwest Neo-Kantian Urge for Unifying Kant's Dualism

The Neo-Kantians thematize Kant primarily from a systematic and not from a historical perspective. Notwithstanding the fact that Neo-Kantians like Hermann Cohen, Ernst Cassirer, or Bruno Bauch provide extensive Kant interpretations too (Cohen 1889; 1910; 1918; Cassirer 1994b; 1994a, vol. 2, 585–762; Bauch 1923a), the spiritus rector of Southwest Neo-Kantianism, Wilhelm Windelband, phrases it clearly: “Understanding Kant means to surpass him,” (Windelband 1915, IV) that is to develop Kant's thought further.⁹ Neo-Kantian philosophy basically is about the problem of validity. Kant's contribution to philosophy is valued regarding his insight into the problem of validity as well as into the method of how to cope with it. Yet Kant's contribution should not only be reactivated but also re-actualized.

For the Neo-Kantians, Kant's conception of the ‘transcendental’ essentially concerns an entirety of grounds of validity. It cannot be captured by referring to a being beyond the cognitive relationship but only by turning reflexively towards thought as the grounds of all validity. The objective validity of the human accomplishments of meaning, of human objectivations, has its foundations in a set of validity principles, or as Kant would put it: in a set of ‘conditions of the possibility’ of such accomplishments. The objective validity of these validity principles is made plausible by showing that they are validity conditions of such theoretical or non-theoretical (practical, aesthetical, etc.) objectivations, that is productions of phenomena of meaning. Like Kant, both the Marburgian Neo-Kantians and the Southwest Neo-Kantians are eager to determine the determinacy of knowledge by determining the validity determinacy of cognition. By taking Kant's transcendental philosophy as a theory of validity, possible ‘metaphysical’ residues and ‘psychological’ depravations in Kant's doctrine are extin-

tion of the ‘I think’ as a transcendental unity of apperception is taken over by the ‘concept’ in its speculative meaning; a real subject, then, is at issue not before Hegel's philosophy of subjective spirit.

⁹ See in this spirit also Cohen (1902, VII), Rickert (1924/25, 163–166; 1899, *Vorbemerkung*), or Natorp (1974, 243; 1912, 194; 196). – Of course, one should not fall victim to the suggestion that the Kant interpretation of both main schools of Neo-Kantianism is homogeneous (Cohen's Kant interpretation, for example, has been harshly criticized by both Marburgians and Southwest Neo-Kantians). The relationship between Kant and Neo-Kantianism is addressed in many studies. See, among others, Heinz and Krijnen (2007).

guished or at least subordinated to the overarching validity-theoretical content of Kant's transcendental philosophy.¹⁰

Regarding the first dimension of the schematism problem – the foundational background dualism of intuition and concept or sensibility and understanding –, Kant's *transcendental aesthetic* was heavily criticized not only in the early phase of German idealism but in Neo-Kantianism too. For Hegel, Kant does not develop both stems of knowledge “from the concept” but picks them up merely “empirically,” in particular from psychology (Hegel 1971, vol. 20, 339). The Neo-Kantians are basically of the same opinion. Without doubt, the problems Kant's philosophy aimed to deal with emerged from the context of German metaphysics of his time and British empiricism. In this context, Kant poses the question concerning the “relationship between knowledge and its object” and answers it with his *Critique of Pure Reason*. The Neo-Kantians, though, operate in a philosophical situation characterized by other problems. In particular it is significant that in their time German idealism had declined and German empiricism arisen. By returning to Kant, the Neo-Kantians intend to sublimate both developments. It therefore is not surprising that the Neo-Kantian treatment of Kant leads them to a different systematic conception of philosophy.

The first component in Kant's *Transcendental Aesthetic* that does not satisfy Southwest Neo-Kantianism exactly concerns the mentioned background dualism, and hence the problem of constitution addressed by Kant's *Transcendental Aesthetic*: the problem of the meaning, function, and justification of both “stems” (CPR B 29) of knowledge. For my thesis it suffices to point to the tendency, decisive for Southwest Neo-Kantianism too (Krijnen 2007), to develop Kant's dualism of stems further towards their unity. This culminates in Heinrich Rickert's “model of a theoretical object in general” (Rickert 1924, 10 ff.; 1921, 50 ff.). Here, it becomes apparent that form and content are part of the concept of thought as the (theoretical) thought of something. Content itself turns out to be part of the model of an object. On this most fundamental level of self-relation of objective thought to content particular forms like ‘time’ and ‘space’ do not play any role. ‘Content as such’ is, as Rickert articulates it, the ‘logical place for the a-logical’: it guarantees the relatedness of thought to content and with this makes a plurality of specific contents possible.

Rickert's approach results, compared to Kant, in a different, more uniform model of constitution of experience in its original determinacy, its primary con-

¹⁰ See on the multidimensional character of Kant's transcendental thought, for instance, the Kant scholar Zocher (1959), who himself stems from Southwest Neo-Kantianism. Recently, Flach (2015, 24) has diagnosed a “double ontological and power-theoretical burden” in Kant's philosophy that should be avoided by a post-Kantian philosophy of validity.

stitution. This *epistemological* issue at the same time functions as the basis for a subsequent *methodological* issue, namely the knowledge of the non-philosophical sciences – the second component of Southwest Neo-Kantian criticism of Kant's transcendental aesthetic. The reproach here is that Kant's transcendental aesthetic with its forms 'time' and 'space' restricts what is given immediately to what is given by the senses. For Rickert's theory of knowledge and science as well as for his ontology, this second component is equally important. Both components are essential parts of the reception and transformation of Kant's *Transcendental Aesthetic* of the *Critique of Pure Reason* by Southwest Neo-Kantianism. This second component concerns not § 1 of the *Critique* (CPR A 19/B 33ff.), the function of intuition, but §§ 2ff. (CPR B 37ff.), the forms of what has been intuited (Krijnen 2013).

Both components are relevant for the problem of schematism. The first concerns Kant's dualism of stems versus Rickert's model of an object as such, that is Rickert's heterology, guiding the Southwest Neo-Kantians. At issue in Kant's dualism of stems and Rickert's heterology is the basic structure of knowledge as a model of validity functions of cognition. Both propose a whole that consists of two parts. Kant thinks of this whole as consisting of "two stems of human cognition," as he continuously emphasizes (even immediately before the *Transcendental Aesthetic* (CPR B 29)). He develops the determinacy of these stems in § 1 and returns to this at the beginning of the 'transcendental logic', talks of "two fundamental sources of the mind" ("receptivity" and "spontaneity") or "intuition" and "concept" as the "elements of all our cognition" (CPR A 50/B 74). Knowledge is qualified by the cognitive moments of 'intuition' and 'concept' or rather 'receptivity' and 'spontaneity'. These two sources of knowledge make up its fundamental determinacy; they are shown to be the basic principles of knowledge. They constitute knowledge. Knowledge is an interrelated validity functional whole of the principles of intuition and the concept, of *aesthetical* and *logical* conditions.

Therefore, knowledge, in its validity structure, oscillates between *indeterminacy* and *determinacy*: The aesthetical and logical conditions of knowledge constitute the *givenness* of an object as well as *thinking* an object (CPR B 29f.; A 50/B 74f.). Via sensibility, the object is given, by understanding, the object is thought. Correspondingly, Kant distinguishes principles or forms that guarantee the knowledge function of intuition, i. e. the forms of time and space; and principles or forms that guarantee the knowledge function of thought, i. e. the pure concepts of understanding or categories. Both elementary functions of knowledge define knowledge in its fundamental structure in two constitutive respects. Both cooperate in the constitution of knowledge: "thoughts without content are empty, intuitions without concepts are blind. [...] These two faculties or ca-

pacities cannot exchange their functions. [...] Only from their unification can cognition arise". (CPR A 51/B 75 f.)

The 'transcendental aesthetic' addresses knowledge as a representation of an undetermined object: a singular representation (*repraesentatio singularis*). Intuition represents the object *immediately*. The relevance of intuition, sensibility, or receptivity for knowledge is that it supplies material for knowledge; it establishes the undetermined object that needs to be determined, that is a substrate of possible determinations, starting from the "sensation" (*sensatio*) as the lowest genetic level of "representation with consciousness" (CPR B 376). As an "effect of an object on the capacity to represent, as far as we are affected by it" (CPR B 34), the sensation, taken by itself, concerns a mere "subjective perception," and is completely validity indifferent, merely material for knowledge (see CPR B 34; A 50/B 74). The intuition Kant deals with, however, is not a merely validity-unrelated sensation of impressions but an already a priori formedness of the supplied material. Empirical intuition is only relevant for knowledge because 'pure' intuition guarantees its relation to an object. Regarding this function of representing the object immediately, intuition is both opposed and assigned to the concept as a *mediated* representation of the object. Together with its validity-functional counterpart 'thought', intuition makes up the determinacy of the content of knowledge.

Although the forms of intuition 'space' and 'time' are intuitive and not conceptual in nature, and hence the forms of intuition not identical with the categories, their validity function is to guarantee the validity relevance of the material for knowledge. Within the whole of validity functions of knowledge, they play a constitutive role. The relationship between intuition and concept in Kant's theory of constitution is that the relatedness to sensibility is a condition of the possibility of knowledge. Pure intuition is for Kant *form* – thus a principle of relations, an a priori factor of the possible determination of objects (CPR B 34 f.).¹¹ *In this respect, intuition and concept do not differ.* Only together do pure concept and pure intuition make a priori objective determination possible.

Both sources of knowledge are captured in their function for knowledge, in their validity relevance. By implication, they are subordinated to the *One* principle that is knowledge and interpreted transcendental philosophically. The cognitive relationship is qualified in its *meaning* not by a hypostasis of two irreducible elements but by the validity functional togetherness of two moments of the One that is knowledge. These two moments are essentially those of indeterminacy

11 The form of intuition enables it to 'order' the 'sensations', 'matter', or 'manifold of appearances' (i. e. the manifold of intuition in its indeterminacy).

(non-understood manifoldness) and determinacy of knowledge. This is the core of the matter Kant is dealing with. The Southwest Neo-Kantians stick to it. With Kant's *implementation* of this thought, however, they are deeply dissatisfied.

3 The Southwest Neo-Kantians on Schematism and Original Unity

3.1 Bauch

The Southwest Neo-Kantian Bruno Bauch, possibly the best of all Neo-Kantian Kant interpreters, commented both in his comprehensive book on Kant (Bauch 1923a) as well as in his major work on theoretical philosophy (Bauch 1923b) on the problem of schematism.¹² Already from his Kant interpretation decisive aspects concerning the basic structure of knowledge are brought to light, in first instance in the context of his elaborations on Kant's transcendental aesthetic.

On the one hand, Bauch wants to discuss the knowledge functional concern of Kant's transcendental aesthetic (Bauch 1923a, 152ff.). The validity function that is at issue is that of establishing a substrate of determinations. On the other hand, Bauch argues against a radical dualism of the two sources or stems of knowledge. For Bauch, both sources are different "validity conditions" or "validity parts". Kant discusses the principles of sensibility too in the "perspective of objective validity" (Bauch 1923a, 153). Due to its own task, for a "science of all principles of a priori sensibility" (*CPR* B 35), despite the original duality of thought and intuition, sensibility cannot be fully a-logical. Rather, for Bauch, already here the idea of a "logical in the a-logical" emerges. Intuition only has relevance for knowledge due to the "concept of knowledge": the concept of knowledge makes possible the task of a transcendental aesthetic *as* a transcendental aesthetic (Bauch 1923a, 154). Accordingly, Bauch pushes Kant's conceptual instruments to the sideline and lets the logical or validity functional role of thought in the concept of knowledge take center stage (Bauch 1923a, 155f.).

¹² Recently, Pringe (2015) discussed Bauch's modifications. He underlines the importance of the infinitesimal principle for Bauch's solution of the problem of schematism. Bauch, however, concludes his argument against Kant's approach of schematism on p. 270. The infinitesimal principle plays a role not before his interpretation of the '*Grundsätze*', more precisely of Bauch's elaboration of the categorial determinacy of the sensation as a quantity (Bauch 1923b, 271ff.).

According to Bauch, although sensation does not determine the object, the material of sensation is *relevant for knowledge*, and hence the a posteriori part of the logical as the sphere of the form. *That* the material of a sensation is given, is a condition of the possibility of knowledge and belongs to its formal determinacy – the a posteriori is itself an a priori; form and matter belong together intrinsically (Bauch 1923a, 157 f.). Whereas the matter is “given” to us in its material content, the “form” enables the manifold of the appearance, as Kant says, to be ordered (*CPR* B 34). For Bauch, this ‘enabling’ also hints towards the *relationship* of intuition and thought, and hence of transcendental aesthetic and transcendental logic (Bauch 1923a, 159). The a priori means for Bauch the “logical-lawful meaning” qua condition of the possibility of knowledge (Bauch 1923a, 159 f.), thus the relationship between receptivity and spontaneity. This relationship reaches from the matter of sensations to the forms of thought. Only because the form of spontaneity as the sphere of the logical also rules the matter of sensations, does this matter logically belong to the concept of knowledge (Bauch 1923a, 159 f. incl. note 4).

Bauch lays down precisely the logical relationship between form and matter in its systematical meaning. This leads him to numerous complaints about Kant, even if Bauch himself at the same time tries to relativize his criticism (at least regarding the fundamental aspects) by a kind of ‘letter – spirit strategy’. From early Kant scholarship on, and for Bauch too, Kant’s doctrine of the two sources of knowledge is reproached for having a certain ontic characteristic, despite the objective-logical meaning of both sources.¹³ In Bauch’s view, the duality remains guiding for the *Critique of Pure Reason*, notwithstanding the fact that Kant aims to connect both validity functions in his conception of concrete knowledge; the possibility of knowledge itself requires their unity (Bauch 1923a, 148; 153; 156). Although Bauch concedes that Kant’s method to ‘isolate’ form and matter of sensibility as well as sensibility and understanding (*CPR* B 34–36) is not meant as an objective separation of different issues that belong together but as a methodological distinction in the sense of a perspective,¹⁴ he holds the reproach of iso-

13 Bauch (1923a, 147 f.). Zocher observes, notwithstanding Kant’s transcendental or ‘semantical’ orientation, an “ontic” (an ontical idealism) in no less than three variations: a “metaphysical,” “psychological,” and “vague” idealism (Zocher 1959, 41 ff. with 47; 1954, 180 f.; 190 ff.).

14 Bauch (1923a, 158 f.). Although Heidemann (2002, 78 ff.) regards Kant’s method of isolation as positive, he must confess that it causes the problem of how to mediate intuition and concept in concrete knowledge, that is to say the problem of schematism, with the consequence that the original heterogeneity and irreducibility of intuition and concept cannot be strict. Yet Heidemann has to face the problem that such a beginning of philosophical concept formation is, in accordance with Hegel’s criticism of Reinhold (Hegel 1971, vol. 9, § 10 N; vol 5, 68 ff.), merely

lation in the *Critique of Pure Reason* to be correct (Bauch 1923b, 2f.). For Bauch, this isolation leads to an abstraction as in the *Critique of Pure Reason*. In particular in the *Transcendental Aesthetic*, Kant sticks to the independence of given empirical material and logical forms.¹⁵ Yet for Bauch there just is no principle, i. e. 'given material', that is independent of the logical principle or equally original (Bauch 1923a, 200f. with 204). As Bauch shows, the respective parts only have their determinacy in relationship to each other. A firm dualism of form and content distorts the issue at stake (Bauch 1923a, 203). As a result, Bauch claims "objective reason" as the missing foundation (Bauch 1923a, 204). That Kant holds on to the thing-in-itself is for Bauch, seen from a logical perspective, nothing but a futile attempt to guarantee the independence of the object from the subject. In this respect too, Bauch wants to guarantee the validity claim of the empirical material by the necessity of the *concept*.¹⁶

In short, the initial dualism of sources is the problematic situation. It should be replaced by a more original relationship. Bauch opts, in conformity with Kant's transcendental revolution in philosophical thought, for reason, or, more precisely, 'objective reason', as the ultimate foundation. Objective reason is the foundation. Only in the context of objective reason can sensation obtain its relevance for knowledge, i. e. its logical meaning (Bauch 1923b, 204 ff.; cf. 225 ff., 233 ff.). In line with Bauch's persistent validity-functional theory of determination, sensations and the like are *always already* determined categorically in order to be material and sensation at all (Bauch 1923b, 201 ff., 259) – without categorical laws there are no objects to intuit. A constellation like material without categories is for Bauch a totally empty abstraction; such material would not even

hypothetical. Rather, rational foundation of the two stems can only succeed from the concept of knowledge itself in its validity functional meaning. This concept is the 'higher' or 'original' unity of the sources of knowledge. Interestingly enough, Heidemann finally refers to Brandom's theory of discursive praxis and the interpretation of concepts as functions and norms that emerge from it, as it seems to offer a possible unity of intuition and concept. This, however, is exactly the project the Southwest Neo-Kantians are heading for.

15 In contrast to this view, Bauch's merits consist not least in the development of a strict functional understanding of the concept (Bauch 1914; 1923b; 1926).

16 See Bauch (1923a, 163f. note 1 with 164f.; 1923b, 204). See for Bauch's criticism of Kant also Bauch (1914). Here too Bauch criticizes Kant's conception of the relationship between empirical content and categorical form in the *Critique of Pure Reason* (Bauch 1914, 310) as well as the dualism of intuition and category and a "misplaced dogmatism of the thing-in-itself" (Bauch 1914, 332). According to Bauch, in Kant's first *Critique* the "originally ambiguous position of generality and particularity, form and matter of cognition as such as well as within the form of concept and intuition" *nolens volens* is retained (Bauch 1914, 336).

be conceivable *as* material.¹⁷ Kant's famous sentence, thoughts without content are empty, intuitions without concepts blind (*CPR* B 75) for Bauch cannot mean that empty thoughts or blind intuitions do exist, as both are mere abstractions, that is results of a philosophical reflection. As Bauch says, the emptiness of thought and the blindness of intuitions respectively only have meaning in terms of their pureness, and hence, as different objective validity laws (Bauch 1923b, 267; 1982, 266). Regarding the fact that both are objective validity laws, there is no "principal" difference between an intuition and a concept (Bauch 1923b, 268).

Intuition, or the laws of intuition, for Bauch have the validity function to include the "content of sensations" (*Empfindungsinhaltlichkeit*), the "manifold material" in the categorical network of validity in order to determine intuition in conformity with the "law of the concept" (Bauch 1923b, 259 with 267 f.; 1926, 206 f.). Hence, the laws of intuition cannot be fully or "in principle" independent or detached from the laws of the relationship of categories. In any case objective validity is at stake; *as* law determinacy, the laws of intuition are subjected to categorical laws (Bauch 1923b, 267 ff.). Consequently, Bauch does not model the distinction between types of validity laws as an "isolation" in need of a mediator. Their unity is already apparent in any concrete object of intuition as determined by transcendental laws.¹⁸ The material of knowledge is included in the forms of the validity relations of objective thought.

It is in this context that Bauch makes remarks about the problem of *schema-tism* in Kant. For Bauch, Kant fails to understand the relationship between intuition and concept adequately, as "most evidently" is the case in schematism (Bauch 1923b, 270). Although time and space are no categories or concepts, in Kant their distinction turns into an isolation in need of a uniting mediator – despite the fact, recognized by Kant, that without such a unity neither an object of intuition nor the intuition of an object is possible. Pure intuition and category or concept are not separated from each other but, for Bauch, belong together in the "determinacy of the concrete object by laws of transcendental logic" (*transzendentallogische Bedingtheit des konkreten Gegenstandes*). Any "artificial unification" is superfluous here. In a similar fashion Bauch notes in his monograph on Kant that Kant initially isolates intuition and concept fully, although this iso-

¹⁷ Bauch (1923b, 259). See Bauch (1926, 203 f.), where conceptualizing the content of sensation in an isolating fashion is criticized as an abstract way of handling the issue.

¹⁸ Bauch (1923b, 270). According to Bauch, in the *Critique of Pure Reason* Kant holds on too much on the "isolation" of form and content (Bauch 1923b, 304, 308). Kant's talk of a 'swarm of sensations' is denounced as an empty abstraction (Bauch 1923b, 259; 1926, 203; 243). (Kant himself speaks of a "swarm of appearances" (*CPR* A 111).)

lation is only possible in abstraction and reflection and not in knowledge (Bauch 1923a, 233). For Bauch, this becomes fatal in Kant's doctrine of the principles of pure understanding (*Grundsätze des reinen Verstandes*), as the initial isolation is not taken as a mere product of reflection but as an objective constellation. The problem of "application" is modeled into a problem of uniting intuition and concept by a mediator, a third factor, schematism, although they are already united by the concepts of the transcendental and that of synthesis (Bauch 1923a, 234). In Bauch's view, the price Kant finally has to pay for his procedure of isolation and abstraction is the introduction of an artificial mediator (Bauch 1923a, 234; 239). Bauch addresses Kant's chapter on schematism from this perspective (Bauch 1923a, 234 ff.). He rejects the idea of a complete lack of homogeneity of intuition and concept (Bauch 1923a, 235). Yet this this was the constellation that led Kant to the problem of applying categories to appearances. For Bauch, it is a pointless problem; there is no sufficient reason for introducing a mediating third factor, which is the transcendental schema.¹⁹

Although in his interpretation Bauch continuously speaks of a mediation between category and intuition, whereas for Kant the application of categories to *appearances* is at issue, the direction of impact is clear: Bauch aims to overcome the original heterogeneity by an original unity in the concept of knowledge. Consequently, he renders explicit the *internal* laws of validity of this unity. By implication, a schema is superfluous. In Bauch's discussion of Kant's problem of application, that is the problem of concrete determination of an object, it becomes clear that, formulated with regard to Kant's schematism, the sensation of quality becomes a "structural element" of the object of intuition by the concept. The concept puts together the object as a categorical unity of a manifoldness of its elements. In order to be a sensation, sensation is always already embedded in a web of categories, of categorical relationships (and not a mere modification of the state of the subject, merely subjective; in order to be subjective in this way, it must already be objective).²⁰ Certainly, Bauch does not want to give up the "positive meaning" of Kant's schematism, that is its legitimate validity function, but he does so without referring to a third factor: the unity of category and intuition is guaranteed by the category itself (Bauch 1923b, 237). The schema too is categorically conditioned. Its positive meaning boils down to, as Kant says, being a "rule for the determination of our intuition in accordance with a certain general concept" (*CPR* B 180), a "method" or "procedure" for "providing a con-

¹⁹ Bauch (1923a, 236). Bauch refers here also to the analysis of Curtius.

²⁰ Bauch (1923b, 275). See also Bauch's distinction between the sensation of quality (*Qualitätsempfinden*) and the quality of sensation (*Empfindungsqualität*) (Bauch 1923b, 251).

cept with its image” (CPR B 179f.). Intuition is determined by the concept. This determination of intuition by the schema that the category gives to itself in order to give itself an image, that is to determine intuition, for Bauch is the “good sense of schematism” (Bauch 1923a, 239). The schema is the fundamental relationship of unity between the category and the determination of intuition. Without a schema, categories would remain functions of determination without being capable of representing an object. In actual knowledge, category and intuition are what they are only in relation to each other (Bauch 1923a, 240).

So far the issue of originality in Bauch! It already points to the logic of determination of a concrete object. I shall come back to this latter issue in section 4, where the Southwest Neo-Kantian alternative for the mediating function of the schema is discussed. For now, a look at the idea of originality as it is conceived by other Southwest Neo-Kantians shows that it concerns a commonly shared idea.

3.2 Other Southwest Neo-Kantians

Jonas Cohn’s doctrine of *utraquism*,²¹ for instance, concerns the relationship between the ultimate moments of knowledge: form and content of thought, thought form and thought content. Cohn holds that the content is ‘alien to thought’ (*denkfremd*) insofar as it cannot be deduced from thought but is given to thought. However, in order to be thinkable and theoretically relevant at all it needs to contain ‘form’ (the form of being given). Both ultimate moments of thought correlate reciprocally: neither an unformed content nor a form without content are part of the realm of thought. Therefore, Cohn criticizes any fixed, non-utraquistically conceived opposition of concept and intuition (Cohn 1923b, 255). The dualism of sensibility and understanding for him results from of a “rather primitive psychology,” mixing up concepts of powers and values (Cohn 1908, 99). As in Bauch, the relationship between intuitions and concepts is being developed further towards its unity, which is conceived of as a necessary knowledge-functional relationship (Cohn 1908, 117).

Within Southwest Neo-Kantianism, only Emil Lask’s doctrine of judgment is a serious exception from the sketched line of reasoning. Not surprising, then, that Bauch, Cohn, and Rickert all reject Lask’s doctrine as not radical enough (Cohn 1923b, 153f.; Bauch 1923b, 192ff., 200ff.; Rickert 1928, 283f., 335f.,

²¹ See for Cohn’s *utraquism* especially Cohn (1923b). Also compare Cohn (1908, 116ff.; 1923a, 9f.; 1932, 36f.; 1949).

cf. 278–297, 332ff.). Explicitly referring to Kant (Lask 1923b, 73f., 80; 1923a, 328ff.), Lask introduces a constellation that for the critics mentioned does not exist. Something that is absolutely independent of the logical, something merely “given,” “logical amorphous material” that as “logically naked” and “material substrate” becomes equipped with categorial predicates, a “merely logical addition,” and thus “placed” within categorial determinations (Lask 1923a, 333; 1923b, 73ff.). By contrast, according to the main doctrine content itself is a logical principle. Material independent of validity, material “not-involved” in validity, “alien to validity” (*geltungsfremd*) does not exist within the realm of knowledge. It is not surprising that in Lask scholarship, Lask’s theory of validity has been seen as a positive reception of Kant’s schematism (Nachtsheim 1992, 180–187). Nevertheless, Lask’s conception of ultimate foundations also contains possibilities for a reconciliatory reading. Such a reading, however, would tie Lask back even more strongly to the tendency of the Southwest Neo-Kantian search for unity.²² The key for this is Lask’s concept of “objective form of structure” as “original structure” consisting of the two parts “form and material” (Lask 1923b, 281). Unsurprisingly, in this respect Lask refers to Rickert.

Indeed, Rickert with his ‘model of an object’ has famously and for Southwest Neo-Kantianism decisively tried to conceptualize the relatedness of the parts of the origin. From a systematic point of view, the tendency we saw in Bauch and Cohn to develop Kant’s fundamental dualism of knowledge towards a unity, culminates in Rickert’s model of an object theoretically thought of as such.²³ It addresses the theoretical object as a whole of fundamental logical conditions of all thoughts and thinking related to truth (Rickert 1924, 8ff.; 1921, 50ff.). With that, it determines knowledge in its origin, the theoretical realm itself, the ultimate presupposition of any concrete theoretical determination. The origin establishes theoretical objectivity and thus the cognitive relationship itself.²⁴ Kant’s two stems of knowledge are integrated in the model of an object regarding their primary-constitutive meaning. Accordingly, the model of an object establishes at the

²² See Nachtsheim (1992, 231ff.), who developed this reading further in Nachtsheim (2017). The latter study clearly shows how strongly Lask holds on to the heterology of Southwest Neo-Kantianism. See Lask’s elaborations of “objective original structure” or “objective form of structure” in his doctrine of judgment (Lask 1923a, 364ff., 381ff.). Still, Lask cultivates a hypostatic rhetoric of ‘category – material’, as if both would exist outside the structural unity of knowledge and would be brought together subsequently by cognition.

²³ See on this model extensively Krijnen (2001, ch. 5).

²⁴ Therefore, I do not think that Rickert’s model of an object offers an “analogon” (Nachtsheim 1992, 186, note 28) for the problem of synthesis of form and content in the empirical object, addressed in Kant’s schematism of pure concepts of understanding.

same time a substrate of possible cognitive determinations. Content turns out to be the ‘logical place for the a-logical’ (Rickert 1921, 52; 1924, 12). Obviously, content obtains the status of a principle. Content is a form of logical or theoretical thought. Thought itself posits that to which it relates to and thus involves a self-relation to content. As the logical place for the a-logical, the form ‘content’ guarantees the relatedness of thought to content, and with this enables a manifoldness of contents. Thought appears to be the encompassing unity *within which* the parts (*Glieder*) of the unity are possible themselves.

Insofar as the origin constitutes the possibility of any determination of objects, the logical sphere of origin does not yet concern immediately thought in its determination of objects but only in its *first beginnings* of thinking an object.²⁵ Due to its foundational function, the origin qua beginning of thought is also the beginning of a process of determination; it contains the basic determinacy of the logical sphere of determination too.

Within the horizon of knowledge, there is nothing radically alien to thought, no radical heterogeneity of opposites in need of a subsequent mediation. The relationship of form and content is itself a *relationship of forms*. Only *within* the theoretical realm does the concept of (theoretical) content make sense. Both are equally originally parts of the cognitive relationship that notwithstanding their unbreakable conceptual relatedness are different from each other. Anything that can enter thought is constituted by thought, and hence given by thought itself: only due to its own principles does thought have content. Only within the cognitive relationship do concepts like form or content have meaning. Instead of referring to some non-validity factor, something not constituted by thought, at most there are *levels of relative originality* (layers of apriority).

This idea of relative originality or layered apriority offers the key for solving exactly the problem Kant was aiming at with his doctrine of schematism of the *Critique of Pure Reason*. This issue will be discussed in part 4 regarding Rickert and Bauch, before in part 5 I briefly go into contemporary transcendental philosophy. For now, we can see that Southwest Neo-Kantians like Rickert, Bauch, or Cohn do not intend to extract the material of cognition from its form, but they insist that already content *as* content is characterized by forms. ‘Content’, ‘being’, ‘existing’, ‘material’, and so forth all are determinations of forms without

²⁵ In the terminology of his late work on the logic of the predicate, the object as such (*Etwas überhaupt*) does not yet contain ‘forms of cognition’ but only ‘forms of thought’, that is to say forms of the concept of the subject, not of the concept of the predicate (Rickert 1930, 111ff.). At most, that which is to be determined is posited; as a subject of predication the object is still undetermined. In the realm of determination, the logical object of the origin takes the place of the concept of the subject in judgments. See on this Krijnen (2008b, ch. 8).

which a concrete entity – that in its concreteness always consists of form and content – is formed content by forming forms and would not even be conceivable as ‘material’ and the like. Instead of a harsh dualism of form and content, the intranoseological turn in conceptualizing the grounds of knowledge requires an understanding of content (being, material, etc.) as a form in its relationship to the ‘content of the content’. The latter we can only, as the Neo-Kantian Rickert puts it, “‘undergo’ or ‘intuit’ or experience otherwise a-logically” (Rickert 1921, 53f.; 1924, 13). As any content is always formed content and any form a form filled with content, from the standpoint of *isolation* there is no adequate qualification for a content untouched by forms, a pure a-logical content. We cannot think such a concept logically or theoretically and, hence, the intended issue is theoretically irrelevant.²⁶ A complete isolation of form or thought and content is just a residuum of the direct-intentional cognitive attitude. Yet the fabric of form and content for the Southwest Neo-Kantians has, beyond any ontics, a purely semantical (Zocher) or functional (Bauch) meaning.

4 The Southwest Neo-Kantian Alternative for Kant's Schematism: Methodology

4.1 Rickert

(1) One main result so far is that a radical heterogeneity in the origin of knowledge has been parried and a relationship of mutually and necessary related parts established. However, Kant's problem of schematism does not concern the general relationship between concept and intuition or receptivity and understanding but the more specific problem of applying categories to objects of knowledge, which is the problem of a *concrete determination of objects*. The problem of concretizing knowledge is not solved by the Southwest Neo-Kantians via a mediating third factor but by making explicit the original unity of knowledge, and hence by the concept, form, or idea of knowledge. This leads to a model of layers or levels of principles of objective determination (layered apriority). These levels reach from the origin of knowledge up to its individualization in concrete objects. Yet this idea of individualizing, concretizing, or singularizing concerns both the subjective-logical dimension and the objective-logical dimension of the object. A closer look at Rickert and Bauch makes clear what this means.

²⁶ See Rickert (1921, 53; 1924, 53). Also see Rickert's extensive criticism of epistemological intuitionism (Krijnen 2001, ch. 5.2.2.5).

According to Rickert's heterology, the theory of knowledge does not start with the separation of form and content, subject and object, and the like. Such a separation appears to result from objective thought itself. All thinkable entities consist of form and content. Ontologically seen, the given sensible and intelligible world consists of sensible objects that contain, seen epistemologically, sensible content and intelligible form, as well as intelligible objects (figurations of meaning) consisting, epistemologically seen, of intelligible content and intelligible form.²⁷ For a transcendental philosophy on the level of Rickert's reflection, there is no radical externality to thought, no non-validity factor or something not constituted from validity. There are at the most levels of originality within the theoretical realm. Of course, a content must be 'there' in order to be recognized, but already 'content' is shown to be a principle within the realm of validity. 'There' is something only because of thought. The validity structure of thought is logically prior to any knowledge of being that and what something is. Rickert's levels of relative originality within the theoretical realm reach from the original synthesis of thought in the model of an object as such up to the constitution of concrete objectivity via methodological forms of cognition; they cover the whole spectrum of theoretical determination. By implication, also concepts like *reality* or that of the *given* (for cognition) must be constituted. Here, it is not the relatedness of thought to content (*Inhalt*) that is at issue, but the *specific* meaning of that which is given as material for, e. g., scientific knowledge (hence, givenness on a rather late level of constitution). In short, the cognitive relationship is being *concretized* in terms of a theory of principles; it is conceptually compressed to concrete-objective meaning.

Rickert's philosophy addresses the problem of object constitution in two directions: a subjective-logical and an objective-logical direction.²⁸ His epistemological opus magnum, *Der Gegenstand der Erkenntnis*, is designed subjective-logically. In the course of several revisions, Rickert outlined the objective-logical dimension too. As Rickert propagates a logical primacy of the objective direction, it is not so much about two directions of the theory of knowledge but about the exploration of two dimensions or reflective modes of knowledge. As a doctrine of the validity determinacy of knowledge, the theory of knowledge always addresses the One '*Gegenstand der Erkenntnis*' in the sense of the *standard* for knowledge. This standard concerns two dimensions. On the one hand, knowledge is

²⁷ Rickert (1939a; 1939b; 1934). This also leads to an important difference with regard to Kant's Transcendental Aesthetics of the *Critique of Pure Reason*, §§ 2ff.: For Rickert (and subsequent transcendental philosophy in general), time and space are not the original forms of what is given immediately. See Krijnen (2013).

²⁸ Rickert (1909; 1912; 1928). See for the following also Krijnen (2014b).

thematical as 'that which is thought', and hence as an objective figuration, as an object: the objectivity of knowledge is at issue here. This concerns validity as an entirety of principles that guarantee the objectivity of cognitive performances. Whereas on the objective route the 'object' is thematical in itself and hence detached from the cognizing subject, the subjective route deals with knowledge as *cognition* of an object by a subject: the subjectivity of knowledge is at issue here. This concerns validity in its logical *performance*. Within the realm of cognition, that '*what*' is thought as an objective configuration has to be distinguished logically from that '*through which*' it is thought as a subjective configuration.

These two different issues of the theory of knowledge not only lead to different determinations of knowledge, they also have two different points of departure of validity reflection. The theory of knowledge always departs from a fact, a *factum*, some reality. Rickert's subjective route, also called the transcendental-psychological route, departs from the fact of cognizing; from the real cognitive act. From this subjective act, the theory of knowledge makes its way gradually to the transcendent object as the ground of all objectivity: from the subject to the object. The objective route, also called the transcendental-logical route, deals as soon as possible and regardless of the psychological act of knowing with the transcendent object in itself: the objective route progresses pure logically. In contrast to the subjective approach, for the objective approach the question about cognizing the object by a subject takes a back seat. Therefore, the starting point of reflection is not the subjective-logical fact of cognizing but the objective-logical of cognition: the (supposedly) true proposition.

In chapter five of *Der Gegenstand der Erkenntnis*, Rickert offers a discussion of empirical realism, typical of the non-philosophical sciences. He aims to show its compatibility with transcendental idealism. This discussion is of interest insofar as from a systematic point of view the problem of concretizing knowledge is at issue – albeit in a subjective-logical fashion – and hence the issue of Kant's chapter on schematism.

From this subjective-logical perspective, levels of appropriating the object by the subject are elaborated on. The validity ground of knowledge, the 'object' qua standard of cognition has already been shown by Rickert to be an "ought," not a "real existing being" (Rickert 1928, 350). The cognizing subject is regarding its validity subjected to a factor that norms its performances. According to Rickert's view that the theory of knowledge is a theory of forms, his analysis in chapter five concerns the 'form' of knowledge too, and hence the principles of validity. More in particular, it deals with a specific form, which Rickert calls the "category". Through the category, the "act of cognition becomes objective" (Rickert 1928, 361; 366). Rickert addresses this subjective logically (Rickert 1928, 362 ff.).

It turns out to be a complex issue, consisting of many forms that have a function for capturing the object of cognition by the cognitive act (Rickert 1928, 365 ff.). Characteristic of the category from a subjective-logical perspective is that it, so to speak, concerns the “transition from the ought to the realm of real beings,” that is to say that Rickert’s category is the moment that “attaches” or “predicates” the relevant form to the content (Rickert 1928, 366). The category is the form of attaching, “predicating” and thus the form of meaning typical of the “act of recognition”; it concerns the act of capturing the object by the cognizing subject (Rickert 1928, 355 ff.). That the validity of cognition “grounds” (Rickert 1928, 369) in the category as the form of recognition of theoretical normativity is explained by Rickert subjective logically. Knowledge turns out to be a process of providing forms. Rickert’s subjective-logical intranoseological interpretation leads to a whole of subjective-logical forms of knowledge which makes clear what cognition “presupposes and must presuppose in order to claim objectivity” (Rickert 1928, 369).

After it has been clarified subjective logically what it means that cognition becomes objective, Rickert discusses particular problems, showing the compatibility of transcendental idealism and empirical realism. Interesting, from a methodological point of view, for the idea of a subjective-logical treatment of the foundations of knowledge and the promise of reconciling the forms of knowledge and the reality that it contains is the following.

The first particular problem concerns the issue of “givenness.” For Rickert, givenness is a category and as such a subjective-logical figuration (Rickert 1928, 371 f.). At stake is the meaning of concrete objective empirical knowledge regarding the problem of givenness. Therefore, Rickert clarifies the form of givenness – Rickert also speaks of facticity (*Tatsächlichkeit*) – for empirical knowledge. He shows that the validity of judgements of facticity or givenness are based upon the form in as far as the category, as the form of the act of cognition, grants them “objectivity” (Rickert 1928, 372). That what is actually ‘given’ is shown to be determined by forms. The opposition between what is actually given or “experience” and “thought” is replaced by thought as the formal foundation of any cognition of reality (Rickert 1928, 378; 381).

This reduction of empirical realism to the issue of givenness (*Tatsächlichkeit*) is of course insufficient to understand the meaning of empirical knowledge. Its meaning contains further presuppositions, reaching far beyond that which is given. It contains especially the presupposition that facts are always part of a larger context. Indeed, scientific knowledge in particular aims at a coherent whole of cognition (Rickert 1928, 383). This striving for coherent cognition of reality has a subjective-logical foundation too. As every science deals with material at issue, regarding the claim of empirical knowledge Rickert distinguishes two

aspects: 1) The material and 2) its cognitive treatment. Rickert shows the compatibility of idealism and realism both for the material and for its treatment. Of course, something like 'material' represents a rather advanced level of constitution of the object and thus a concretization of the relationship of form and content. On top of that, what I have just said applies not only to scientific knowledge but to knowledge in general.

Within the sketched context, the compatibility of thought and reality boils down to showing that also the material of knowledge, the interrelated real world, presupposed by the cognizing subject, contains, from the perspective of transcendental idealism, "forms of relationships" (Rickert 1928, 389 f.). It always turns out to be the category that forms the transition from the dimension of "the ought to that of reality"; in this case the category of *relatedness* (Rickert 1928, 393). Cognizing persistently remains recognizing norms that function as the standard also for our judgements of reality (Rickert 1928, 394 f.).

More specifically, these concern forms of recognition of the "epistemological subject". This abstract subject without flesh and blood constitutes the objective reality subjective logically, that is to say the world that from an empirical realist point of view seems to be existing in itself (Rickert 1928, 397 f.). At the same time, however, it is understood how for the real, "cognizing subject" (with flesh and blood) an independent objective world can exist at all, since for the *cognizing* subject the *epistemological* subject makes up the "ideal" or norm (Rickert 1928, 397 ff.). Rickert's idealism even conceives of the objective reality as the "reality untouched by any forms of scientific or pre-scientific concept formation of a real subject" (Rickert 1928, 414). Such a world, however, is from the start determined by forms.

After the problem of objective reality has been dealt with, Rickert determines the forms that determine the *conceptual determination* of objective reality by the cognizing subject (Rickert 1928, ch. 5., § 5). They concern, regarding scientific knowledge, the "concept of the *science* of reality" (Rickert 1928, 402). These are the so-called methodological forms of knowledge. With these forms, the cognizing subject determines reality *conceptually*. This conceptual determination of objective reality needs to be understood subjective logically too.

Rickert achieves the compatibility on the level of constitution of scientific concept formation about reality.²⁹ Such concept formation again is determined by forms. These concern a process of capturing reality by a transforming performance of the real, cognizing subject ("*umbildendes Auffassen*"), and with this by "methodological forms" that guide the cognizing subject, which regarding their

²⁹ See for pre-scientific knowledge e.g. Rickert (1929, ch. 1.I).

validity do not depend on the cognizing subject (Rickert 1928, 403f.). These methodological forms are also treated by Rickert as *forms of recognition*. They produce the meaning of statements about reality subjective logically. Consequently, also the “objectivity” of scientific concept formation depends subjective logically on the fact whether their “forms are grounded upon valid norms” (Rickert 1928, 431). A transcendental ought functions as the validity “foundation” of any cognition.

So far, the subjective logical reflection. Rickert also reflects objective logically on objectivity (Rickert 1939c; 1921; 1930). In particular his *Logik des Prädikats* (1930) attempts to begin not with the performance of cognizing but aims to show what forms make up that which is thought (at least in its constitutive dimension as methodological forms are not discussed here)³⁰. It presents a theory of objective-logical object constitution, starting with the “most simple logical meaning and archaic predicates” (*Urprädikate*) (Rickert 1930, 70 ff.).

Interestingly enough, Rickert translates predicate here in a logical sense as κατηγορούμενον, and hence as a form of propositions (*Aussagen*), propositions not in the subjective logical sense as stating but objective logically as its result, as that what is stated. Of course, here too, it turns out that a ‘logical’ foundation precedes any ‘ontology’: transcendental idealism remains the foundation of any possible realism; logically, that which is real is always that “which is *predicated* as real” (Rickert 1930, 78–80). In his doctrine of forms of thought and forms of knowledge, Rickert (1930, 111 ff.) shows that already the logical subject (the concept of the subject in judgments), and hence that which is thinkable at all and therefore cognizable, is determined by forms. The issue of deictic expressions like ‘this’, dealt with in his book on the *Gegenstand der Erkenntnis* within the context of constitutive forms of reality, returns in the *Logik des Prädikats* as the immediate relationship to a sensible intuition, which presupposes “identity” as a form (of thought) (Rickert 1930, 114 ff.; 141).

In short, the thesis of a compatibility of, as Kant puts it, category and appearance has proved to be correct – appearances are on any level of their determinacy determined by forms. The logical dependence of everything that in one way or another ‘is’ of the forms of thought and cognition leads Rickert to surpass the subjective-logical determination towards a validity-functional noematic, objective-logical differentiation of principles of theoretical validity. These reach from the level of pure heterogeneity of the origin of cognition via its concretization in judgements up to the constitution of concrete-objective meaning consti-

³⁰ Rickert has discussed them extensively in his monographs on methodology (Rickert 1929; 1926).

tuted by archaic predicates and subsequent categorical forms of objective reality as well as methodological forms of cognition. Yet it is Bauch who develops a theory of knowledge in a strict objective-logical fashion. Moreover, he does so in discussion both with realism and Kant. Concluding my elaborations on Southwest Neo-Kantianism, I shall show why also for Bauch, Kant's doctrine of schematism is unnecessary regarding the problem of concretizing cognition.

4.2 Bauch

As for Rickert, also for Bauch is reality an important philosophical problem. At stake are questions like what reality is, what it means that reality is given, how reality must be in order to be recognizable, how it relates to the cognizing subject and its thought.³¹ Accordingly, for Bauch too the notion of 'fact' becomes an epistemological problem. As in Rickert's philosophy both 'that' (*Dasein*, existence) and 'what' (*Sosein*, quality) are posited in the realm of knowledge and therefore subject to the validity laws of knowledge, if it should be possible at all that for the subject matter to become an object of cognition, even (logically) to be at all (Bauch 1915; 1923b, 123 ff.).

Bauch in particular fulminates against an abstract conception of the concept and conceives of form and content as an intrinsic relationship. Continuously it turns out that being in its possibility is founded in thought. This results, as in Rickert, in a transcendental idealist conception of an object. The object qua standard or measure of cognition is for Bauch (1923b, 91 f.) not an existing reality but a whole of relations of validity (*Geltungsbeziehungen*). Actual, concrete, real cognition is oriented towards such validity relations and thus obtains its validity. These relations, and hence the concept, is the object qua measure for the cognizing subject (Bauch 1923b, 217 ff.). Both for Rickert and Bauch the "foundation of reality" (Bauch 1923b, 126; 1982, 254) is a non-real realm. Just like Rickert, Bauch too rejects realism as an adequate epistemological position while at the same time accepting "empirical realism". In his methodology of the empirical sciences, Bauch follows, notwithstanding several modifications in detail and the dominant objective logical perspective, Rickert's approach.

How does Bauch's theory of knowledge as an objective-logical theory surpass Kant's schematism as a mediating third factor? To be sure, Bauch also takes the subjective-logical dimension of knowledge into account. He integrates,

31 Bauch (1923b, part I, esp. 93 ff.; 1982, 255 ff.). See for Bauch's theoretical philosophy notably Bauch (1923b). Also see Bauch (1923/24; 1926; 1982).

so to speak, both routes of Rickert but in a more uniform way and from the start from an objective-logical perspective. As a consequence, the significance of forms of knowledge as principles of *objective* determinacy becomes very clear.

For Bauch, the problem of knowledge both concerns the dimension of cognizing and cognition. Yet the former has to be developed from the latter, from the theory of knowledge in an objective perspective (Bauch 1923b, 49; 1923/24; 1982). Both the object as well as its cognition underlie *mutual* conditions: conditions of *truth*. Whereas cognizing is shown to be a process of relating which, regarding its validity, can only direct itself towards relations, relations of validity, of truth, the object too turns out to be a relation based upon truth relations. Truth relations (and the truth is nothing but the whole of them) therefore are objective-logical and hence trans-subjective relations. Bauch conceives of them as *objective validity functions*. To be an object implies to stand in relations and to cognize is to direct oneself towards relations.

More precisely, the constitution of the object of knowledge as well as its cognition take place via three types of truth or validity relations: the *category*, the *concept*, and the *idea*. Concerning cognition of real objects, in the first instance the order of the *content of sensations* by which the object is given is at stake. For being a sensation at all, sensations must be part of a *relation* (being, identity, difference, contentuality, etc.). This relation is the *category*. Like Kant, but in contrast to Rickert, Bauch conceives of the category strictly in its objective-logical meaning: categories are principles of objective determinacy, not relations of cognizing but of that which is cognized. Reality presupposes such relationships. The category itself, then, is part of a relationship too, determining the object (thing, property, cause, effect, one, many etc.). The relation between the categories, which determines the object, is the *concept*. The concept is, as Bauch formulates it, “the objective law of formation of the object as an object of cognition” (“*objektives Bildungsgesetz des zu erkennenden Gegenstandes*”).³² The concept makes up the relationship between the categories. At the same time, the objects are constituted by concepts and hence categories. The relation between the concepts is the foundation of both our cognition of objects and the objects of our cognition. This philosophy of relationships finally leads to the whole of all relationships, i. e. the *idea*. The idea is the system of concepts. Hence, it is the objective-validity relationship that, as the whole of conditions of objects, constitutes reality and its cognition.

³² Bauch (1982, 265). Bauch also characterizes it as the function of the direction from the general to the particular (Bauch 1923b, 283 ff.; 1926, 101 f.; 131 ff.; 188; 1982, 266).

Validity relations are conditions of the objectivity of objects. Consequently, they are themselves not objects. They underlie all being from the start and persistently. Like Rickert, Bauch also elaborates on this with regard to the method of concrete-objective determination qua cognition of reality. According to Bauch's theory of truth, a part of the fundamental structure of truth is the *method*. The method is the way to the truth. In short, Bauch holds that knowledge has a validity-noematic structure that covers the whole spectrum of determination: it reaches from the origin of objectivity to the determinacy of concrete objects while at the same time the cognitive relationship remains with itself.

5 Outlook: Post-War Kantian Transcendental Philosophy of Hans Wagner and Werner Flach

Essentially, it is the same story in the transcendental philosophy of Hans Wagner (1980) and Werner Flach (1994). To solve the problem of concretization of determinacy, no Kantian schema is necessary. On the basic level of foundations, Kant's doctrine of schematism does not play a role. As I have discussed this already in detail with regard to Rickert and Bauch, I shall conclude with some general remarks.

Both Wagner and Flach develop their philosophy in terms of a validity noematics, i. e. the primacy of Rickert's objective route. Therefore, systematically, they follow Bauch's approach. Kant's dualism of two sources of knowledge is, under influence of Neo-Kantianism and Richard Höningwald, revised and transformed into a four-pillar cognitive relationship that integrates validity noematic and validity noetic aspects (Wagner 1980, 1 ff.; Flach 1994, 145 ff.). The revision follows Kant's own idea of the primacy of the validity-noematic perspective. As in Bauch, the analysis of the content (*Gehalt*) takes center stage. Accordingly, the problem of actualizing, individualizing, or concretizing knowledge is dealt with in a validity-noematic fashion.

Wagner solves the problem of concretization by a model of layered apriority. This model provides specific principles for concretizing knowledge, i. e. the so called "regulative" and "systematic" apriority. For the cognizing subject these are normative constraints (Wagner 1980, § 23 f.; 1992, § 9). They emerge in the course of Wagner's validity-noematic reflection. It is a reflection on the principles of the validity of that which is thought – hence, not a reflection on "that

I think” (Wagner 1992, 208 f.; 1980, §§ 4–7).³³ Thought is conceived of as the principle of objectivity (Wagner 1980, 22 ff.; 1992, 227 ff.). As such a principle, it differentiates itself logically into that which is thought and the object of thought (subject and object, mind and world, etc.). With regard to its validity, thought cannot recur to external instances, but it is on its own and in that sense unconditioned: it contains the validity conditions of its thinking in itself. Like Rickert and Bauch, Wagner holds that any theory of knowledge that takes its point of departure for determining knowledge in the separateness of the two parts subjects and object, mind and world, or the like goes astray (Wagner 1992, 228; 1980, 192).

On the level of the origin of cognition, there cannot be any radical dualism of heterogeneous factors. Rather, thought concretizes itself as a principle into thought as concrete instances. The objective validity of thoughts of cognizing subjects is assured by obeying the principles, laws, or norms of knowledge. Here is where the idea of validity-noematic levels of apriority comes into play. The principles of knowledge consist of different types, each with its own grade of fundamentality, reaching from the origin up to concrete objects and their relationships. A radical heterogeneity of parts of this relationship in need of mediation by a third factor in Wagner too does not exist. All moments within a layer of apriority as well as the layers of apriority themselves as layers of a whole cohere in the form of reciprocal implications of the parts (Wagner 1980, 175; see 194 for the regulative apriority). Accordingly, for Wagner, as he formulates it with a view to Kant, sensibility and understanding from a transcendental

33 Birrer (2017, 248 f.) is right in emphasizing that schematism is about bringing together intuition (individual case) and concept (rule), but as he stresses the action of “deciding” whether a given object is in accordance with a rule, the decisive logical aspect, namely that the object is *determined* by the concept, and hence the concretizing function of the schema, disappears. The “argumentative contribution” of the chapter of schematism is, for Birrer, to “examine” the synthesis of understanding with respect to its “justified subsumption” (Birrer 2017, 252). As Birrer (2017, 253) himself quotes Kant’s statement that the schemata of pure understanding enable it “to subject appearances to general rules [...] and thereby to make them fit for a thoroughgoing connection in one experience,” (CPR B 185) it is important to point to the difference between examining and subjecting. If my interpretation is correct, Birrer therefore needs to introduce a “double perspective” regarding transcendental schematism: “making subsumption possible” and “constituting experience” (Birrer 2017, 264 ff.). Caimi (2015, 201 f.) simply writes that schematism concerns the representation of the “subsumption of concrete objects [...] Hence, categories as concepts of cognition must be applied, they are attached as predicates to concrete, singular appearances.” See for Kant’s parlance of “subsumption” as a relationship of heterogeneity (and not of subsumption of concepts) Flach (2001). Kant’s presentation of schematism in terms of ‘subsumption’ has given rise to numerous critical analyses.

perspective are no powers or functions that exist in themselves: they interrelate in the form of reciprocal implication.³⁴

With regard to the main line of thought of a validity-noematic foundation, Flach's theory of knowledge, the most advanced development of the presented project of foundations of knowledge, does not differ.³⁵

34 Wagner (1980, 192). Bunte (2017, 79 ff.) tries to defend Kant against Wagner's criticism of the origin of the categories. He does so, however, by referring to a Kantian doctrine that Wagner explicitly rejects: the doctrine of "transcendental apperception". Moreover, Bunte speaks about judging, whereas for Wagner the judgment is at stake (not the noetic dimension). An 'I think' and thus Kant's apperception-theoretical emphasis of the foundations of objectivity is rejected as the highest point of transcendental philosophy. The cognitive relationship itself makes up the foundation. Whereas Wagner relates Kant's metaphysical deduction and the relationship between judgment and categories addressed here to his transition from primary to secondary apriority, Bunte (2017, 83) holds that in Wagner the "transcendental schema" delivers this transition. This cannot be the case, already because in the course of Kant's transcendental deduction it is shown that "all sensible intuitions stand under the categories" (CPR B 20). Thus, the transition from primary to secondary apriority has already been conducted. Wagner's primary apriority is indifferent with respect to the type of givenness (sensible, non-sensible): objectivity as such (being of entities, *Sein des Seienden*) is at stake here (the passage of Wagner Bunte refers to – that the principles of cognition of an object must at the same time be the principles of the object of cognition (Wagner 1980, 169) – is not only about relativizing this convertibility by primary apriority; Wagner also has given up the restriction of knowledge to "experience," which for Kant is "essential" (Wagner 1980, 168 f.). Hence, Wagner's secondary apriority cannot immediately concern the dimension of "self-determination of thought in the mode of time" (Bunte 2017, 84). On top of that the transcendental schema is not about the categorical determinacy of objects but about applying categories to objects of knowledge. Wagner consequently does not use Kant's doctrine of schematism for his determination of secondary apriority, let alone for the transition from the primary to the secondary apriority.

35 Concerning the details, there are serious differences, linked to Flach's attempt to advance the conception of the concretization of determinacy. Their systematical significance is high – although, regrettably, within Kant scholarship they are rather unknown. Flach, compared to Wagner, presses forward the validity-functional continuity of thought. A dualism between sensation, giving the object, and category, determining the object, does not exist in his theory. He therefore criticizes Wagner's distinction between secondary apriority, containing the principles of being, and regulative and systematic apriority determining the process of research, which is heuristic in nature, as the sensible given, then, is conceptualized merely in its function to signify concreteness (heuristic principles, strictly speaking, do not concern the sensuous condition of Kant's doctrine of schematism), leading to an ontological burden that fails to do justice to the spirit of Kant's doctrine of schematism. Flach, by contrast, takes Kant's schematism as a contribution to the method of empirical knowledge: concrete empirical knowledge is knowledge of empirical laws, containing the dimensions of observation, description, and explanation. Wagner's function of signification and Kant's function of schematism respectively are transformed by Flach into a function of testing (*Erproben*) the adequacy of an objective proposition (*Sachaussage*).

To be sure, already from Flach's early *Prinzipienlehre der Anschauung* it becomes clear that the problem of schematism belongs to the issue of concretization of knowledge. Flach discusses it in a chapter on intuition and judgment that aims to understand concretization as a structure of judgment (Flach 1963, 146 ff.). In his late *Erkenntnislehre*, however, schematism is no longer a topic for itself. Apparently, from the perspective of foundations, it is of a subordinated interest. Moreover, as becomes clear from the early work, it belongs to the dimension of subjectivity, that is to say to validity noetics.

Concrete noematic determinacy is also for Flach only possible as individualization or concretization of validity. Concretization enriches the structure of the origin towards "meaning that is thematically bounded," "self-mediation of infinity to finity," and hence to a "(contingent) judgment filled with content" (Flach 1963, 146 f.). Intuition here functions as the principle of the logical individualization of validity. In this context, sensibility becomes a problem in terms of principles, a problem that Kant tried to solve in his chapter on schematism (Flach 1963, 147). According to Flach, Kant develops the concretizing function of noematic constitution. The schema is shown to be a rule that provides the concept with its image. This implies for Flach that the schema is not so much a mediating third factor between the heterogeneous category and appearances but rather the peculiar deduction structure of validity-logical individualization. Flach argues that in Kant's doctrine of schematism the idea of a principle transforms that of a mediating third factor. The 'categories' turn into 'principles' (*Grundsätze*). This concretizing of knowledge takes place via the "formal-synthetical structure of the judgment," that is to say it is conceptualized in the fashion of a validity noematics. As in Rickert or Wagner, it leads to clarifying the problem of predication in judgments. The judgment overcomes the heterogeneity of the realm of origin. Logically, a situation of heterogeneity within homogeneity has arisen (Flach 1963, 150 f.).

Flach's *Erkenntnislehre* discusses this in a much more differentiated way. Kant's schematism, however, is addressed only marginally. Yet the line exposed until now is confirmed here. Kant's schematism has its place within Flach's "doctrine of method" (*Methodologie*), more in particular, it becomes a theme as soon as the "specific methods" are at issue, that is to say the "regionalization of scientific knowledge" (Flach 1994, ch. 4.4). Whereas Flach's *Logic* discusses the "constitutivity of the validity noematic structure" (Flach 1994, 249), the *Doctrine of Method* deals with what Flach calls the "organization" of knowledge (Flach 1994, ch. 4, cit. 355), complementary to and (validity theoretically) based upon the constitutive structure of knowledge. It deals with the dimension of "regulative apriority" (Flach 1994, ch. 4.1.2). Due to its methodological nature, knowledge becomes concrete determination or determination related to a con-

crete issue (*sachbezogene und sacherfüllte Bestimmung*). It is here, specifically on the level of the regulative function of specific methods,³⁶ which ensure that cognition is determination of a specific issue, that Flach addresses Kant's doctrine of schematism. It turns out that Kant's subsumption of appearances under the concepts of understanding, finally under pure concepts of understanding for Flach expresses the methodical determinacy of the description of what is given by observation. On the level of appearances, the determinacy of intuition is conceptually determined (Flach 1994, 626 f.).

In sum, in Flach's theory of knowledge, Kant's thesis of heterogeneity is completely taken back into the development of the internal relationships of the validity noematic structure of cognition. In Flach's conception there is only the route leading from the most basic principles of any determinacy to the determined concrete object. Flach holds on to the spontaneity of thought, performing schematizations. Yet he gives up Kant's project of conceiving of the foundations of knowledge in the fashion of a theory of apperception of the I, and hence a theory of consciousness. He gets rid of the externality (*Äußerlichkeit*) of the relationship between what is given and its determination. This externality is replaced, we should perhaps say sublated, by an objective order that is an order of validity-noematic constitution and regulation.

Taking the sketched historical development from Neo-Kantianism to post-war transcendental philosophy into account, there appears to be agreement about the positive meaning of Kant's doctrine of schematism. It concerns *methodology*.

References

- Allison, Henry E. (2004): Kant's Transcendental Idealism, rev. and enl. New Haven.
- Bauch, Bruno (1914): Über den Begriff des Naturgesetzes, in: Kant-Studien 19, pp. 303–337.
- Bauch, Bruno (1915): Idealismus und Realismus in der Sphäre des philosophischen Kritizismus: Ein Verständigungsversuch, in: Kant-Studien 20, pp. 97–116.
- Bauch, Bruno (1923/24): Das transzendente Subjekt: Eine transzendentalphilosophische Skizze, in: Logos 12, pp. 23–49.
- Bauch, Bruno (1923a): Immanuel Kant, 3rd ed. Berlin, Leipzig.
- Bauch, Bruno (1923b): Wahrheit, Wert und Wirklichkeit, Leipzig.
- Bauch, Bruno (1926): Die Idee, Leipzig.
- Bauch, Bruno (1982): Theoretische Philosophie (1931), in: H.-L. Ollig (ed.): Neukantianismus: Texte der Marburger und der Südwestdeutschen Schule, ihrer Vorläufer und Kritiker, Darmstadt, pp. 243–278.

³⁶ See on the doctrine of the general and specific methods Flach (1994, ch. 4.3f.).

- Birrer, Mathias (2017): *Kant und die Heterogenität der Erkenntnisquellen*, Berlin/Boston.
- Bunte, Martin (2016): *Erkenntnis und Funktion: Zur Vollständigkeit der Urteilstafel und Einheit des kantischen Systems*, Berlin/Boston.
- Bunte, Martin (2017): *Wissen und Bestimmtheit: Primär- und sekundärkonstitutive Apriorität bei Kant und Hans Wagner*, in: C. Krijnen, K. Zeidler (ed.): *Reflexion und konkrete Subjektivität: Beiträge zum 100. Geburtstag von Hans Wagner (1917–2000)*, Wien, pp. 75–89.
- Caimi, Mario (2015): *Der Schematismus der reinen Verstandesbegriffe*, in: E. Rainer (ed.): *Kants Theorie der Erfahrung*, Berlin/München/Boston, pp. 201–237.
- Cassirer, Ernst (1994a): *Das Erkenntnisproblem in der Philosophie und Wissenschaft der neueren Zeit*, 4 Bände, Darmstadt.
- Cassirer, Ernst (1994b): *Kants Leben und Lehre*, Nachdr. der Ausg. New Haven, Darmstadt.
- Cohen, Hermann (1889): *Kants Begründung der Aesthetik*, Berlin.
- Cohen, Hermann (1902): *Logik der Reinen Erkenntnis*, Berlin.
- Cohen, Hermann (1910): *Kants Begründung der Ethik: Nebst ihren Anwendungen auf Recht, Religion und Geschichte*, 2nd ed. Berlin.
- Cohen, Hermann (1918): *Kants Theorie der Erfahrung*, 3rd ed. Berlin.
- Cohn, Jonas (1908): *Voraussetzungen und Ziele des Erkennens: Untersuchungen über die Grundfragen der Logik*, Leipzig.
- Cohn, Jonas (1923a): *Selbstdarstellung*, in: R. Schmidt (ed.): *Die Philosophie der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen*, 2. verb. Aufl., Leipzig, pp. 1–21.
- Cohn, Jonas (1923b): *Theorie der Dialektik: Formenlehre der Philosophie*, Leipzig.
- Cohn, Jonas (1932): *Wertwissenschaft*, Stuttgart.
- Cohn, Jonas (1949) Cohn, Jonas, in: W. Ziegenfuß (ed.): *Philosophenlexikon*, Bd. 1, Berlin, pp. 193–197.
- Curtius, Ernst R (1914): *Das Schematismusproblem in Kants Kritik der reinen Vernunft: Eine philologische Untersuchung*, in: *Kant-Studien* 19, pp. 338–366.
- Düsing, Klaus (1995): *Schema und Einbildungskraft in Kants 'Kritik der reinen Vernunft'*, in: L. Kreimendahl (ed.): *Aufklärung und Skepsis: Studien zur Philosophie und Geistesgeschichte des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts*, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt, pp. 47–71.
- Flach, Werner (1963): *Zur Prinzipienlehre der Anschauung. Band 1: Das spekulative Grundproblem der Vereinzelung*, Hamburg.
- Flach, Werner (1994): *Grundzüge der Erkenntnislehre: Erkenntniskritik, Logik, Methodologie*, Würzburg.
- Flach, Werner (2001): *Kants Lehre von der Gesetzmäßigkeit der Empirie. Zur Argumentation der Kantischen Schematismuslehre*, in: *Kant-Studien* 92, pp. 464–473.
- Flach, Werner (2002): *Die Idee der Transzendentalphilosophie: Immanuel Kant*, Würzburg.
- Flach, Werner (2015): *Die kantische Hypothek*, in: W. Bock (ed): *Kant zu Geschichte, Kultur und Recht*, Berlin, pp. 15–25.
- Hegel, Georg W. F. (1971): *Werke in zwanzig Bänden*, edited by E. Moldenhauer and K. M. Michel, Frankfurt am Main.
- Heidegger, Martin (1951): *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik*, 2nd ed., Frankfurt am Main.
- Heidegger, Martin (1962): *Die Frage nach dem Ding. Zu Kants Lehre von den transzendentalen Grundsätzen*, Tübingen.

- Heidemann, Dietmar (2002): *Anschauung und Begriff: Ein Begründungsversuch des Stämme-Dualismus in Kants Erkenntnistheorie*, in: K. Engelhard (ed.): *Aufklärungen* (FS K. Düsing), Berlin, pp. 65–90.
- Heinz, Marion and Krijnen, Christian (eds.) (2007): *Kant im Neukantianismus: Fortschritt oder Rückschritt?*, Würzburg.
- Höffe, Otfried (2003): *Kants Kritik der reinen Vernunft: Die Grundlegung der modernen Philosophie*, München.
- Kant, Immanuel (1998): *Critique of Pure Reason*, translated and edited by P. Guyer and A. W. Wood, Cambridge.
- Kemp Smith, Norman (1918): *A Commentary on Kant's 'Critique of Pure Reason'*, London.
- Krijnen, Christian (2001): *Nachmetaphysischer Sinn: Eine problemgeschichtliche und systematische Studie zu den Prinzipien der Wertphilosophie Heinrich Rickerts*, Würzburg.
- Krijnen, Christian (2007): *Das konstitutionstheoretische Problem der transzendentalen Ästhetik in Kants 'Kritik der reinen Vernunft' und seine Aufnahme im südwestdeutschen Neukantianismus*, in: M. Heinz, C. Krijnen (ed.): *Kant im Neukantianismus: Fortschritt oder Rückschritt?*, Würzburg, pp. 109–134.
- Krijnen, Christian (2008a): *Kants Subjektstheorie und die Grundlegung einer philosophischen Anthropologie*, in: *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 62, pp. 254–273.
- Krijnen, Christian (2008b): *Philosophie als System: Prinzipientheoretische Untersuchungen zum Systemgedanken bei Hegel, im Neukantianismus und in der Gegenwartsphilosophie*, Würzburg.
- Krijnen, Christian (2013): *Geschichtsphilosophie bei Kant, im Neukantianismus und im gegenwärtigen Kantianismus*, in: C. Krijnen, M. de Launay (ed.): *Der Begriff der Geschichte im Marburger und südwestdeutschen Neukantianismus*, Würzburg, pp. 29–57.
- Krijnen, Christian (2014a): *Gegenstandskonstitution bei Husserl und in der klassischen deutschen Philosophie: Eine problemgeschichtliche Deutungslinie*, in: F. Fabbianelli, S. Luft (ed.): *Husserl und die klassische deutsche Philosophie: Husserl and Classical German Philosophy*, Cham/Heidelberg/New York/Dordrecht/London, pp. 115–131.
- Krijnen, Christian (2014b): *Transzendentaler Idealismus und empirischer Realismus*, in: C. Krijnen, K. W. Zeidler (ed.): *Wissenschaftsphilosophie im Neukantianismus: Ansätze – Kontroversen – Wirkungen*, Würzburg, pp. 11–56.
- Lask, Emil (1923a): *Die Lehre vom Urteil* (1912), in E. Lask (1923c), Band II, pp. 283–463.
- Lask, Emil (1923b): *Die Logik der Philosophie und die Kategorienlehre* (1911), in: E. Lask (1923c), Band II, pp. 1–182.
- Lask, Emil (1923c): *Gesammelte Schriften*, edited by Eugen Herrigel. 3 Bände, 1–182. Tübingen.
- Nachtshiem, Stephan (2017) : *La "struttura formale": Un' osservazione sul concetto di fondazione ultima*, in: E. Lask: *Un secolo dopo*, edited by S. Besoli and R. Redaelli, Macerata, pp. 11–22.
- Natorp, Paul (1912): *Kant und die Marburger Schule*, in: *Kant-Studien* 17, pp. 193–221.
- Natorp, Paul (1974): *Zum Gedächtnis Kants (1904)*, in: J. Kopper, R. Malter (ed.): *Immanuel Kant zu Ehren*, Frankfurt am Main, pp. 236–260.
- Pringe, Hernán (2015): *Bruno Bauch and the Comprehensibility of Nature*, in: *Kriterion* 56, pp. 355–370.

- Rickert, Heinrich (1899): *Fichtes Atheismusstreit und die Kantische Philosophie*, Berlin.
- Rickert, Heinrich (1909): *Zwei Wege der Erkenntnistheorie: Transcendentalpsychologie und Transcendentallogik*, in: *Kant-Studien* 14, pp. 169–228.
- Rickert, Heinrich (1912): *Urteil und Urteilen*, in: *Logos* 3, pp. 230–245.
- Rickert, Heinrich (1921): *System der Philosophie: Erster Teil: Allgemeine Grundlegung der Philosophie*, Tübingen.
- Rickert, Heinrich (1924/25): *Alois Riehl*, in: *Logos* 13, pp. 162–185.
- Rickert, Heinrich (1924): *Das Eine, die Einheit und die Eins: Bemerkungen zur Logik des Zahlbegriffs*, 2nd. umg. Aufl., Tübingen.
- Rickert, Heinrich (1926): *Kulturwissenschaft und Naturwissenschaft*, 6. u. 7. durchg. u. erg. Aufl., Tübingen.
- Rickert, Heinrich (1928): *Der Gegenstand der Erkenntnis: Einführung in die Transzendentalphilosophie*, 6. verb. Aufl., Tübingen.
- Rickert, Heinrich (1929): *Die Grenzen der naturwissenschaftlichen Begriffsbildung: Eine logische Einleitung in die historischen Wissenschaften*, 5. verb. u. erw. Aufl, Tübingen.
- Rickert, Heinrich (1930): *Die Logik des Prädikats und das Problem der Ontologie*, Heidelberg.
- Rickert, Heinrich (1934): *Grundprobleme der Philosophie: Methodologie, Ontologie, Anthropologie*, Tübingen.
- Rickert, Heinrich (1939a): *Die Erkenntnis der intelligiblen Welt und das Problem der Metaphysik. Erster Teil* (1927), in: H. Rickert (1939c), pp. 97–138.
- Rickert, Heinrich (1939b): *Die Erkenntnis der intelligiblen Welt und das Problem der Metaphysik. Zweiter Teil* (1929), in: H. Rickert (1939c), pp. 139–185.
- Rickert, Heinrich (1939c): *Unmittelbarkeit und Sinndeutung: Aufsätze zur Ausgestaltung des Systems der Philosophie*, edited by August Faust, Tübingen.
- Wagner, Hans (1980): *Philosophie und Reflexion*, 3rd ed., München/Basel.
- Wagner, Hans (1992): *Die Würde des Menschen: Wesen und Normfunktion*, Würzburg.
- Windelband, Wilhelm (1915): *Vorwort* (1883), in: *Präludien: Aufsätze und Reden zur Philosophie und Ihrer Geschichte*. 5th ed., 2 Bände, III–IV, Tübingen.
- Zocher, Rudolf (1954): *Kants transzendente Deduktion der Kategorien*, in: *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 8, pp. 161–194.
- Zocher, Rudolf (1959): *Kants Grundlehre*, Erlangen.